

Appl. No. : 10/510,466
Filed : October 7, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 19 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in this or any other patent application.

This amendment after final, cancelling Claims 1, 3-10 and 19, is made in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b)(1). Accordingly, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 2 and 11-18 are pending in this application.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3-10 and 19 are provisionally rejected as not patentably distinguishable from Claims 2 and 4-10 of U.S. App. Ser. No. 10/511,397.

Claims 1, 3-10 and 19 are canceled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Fuji (EP 1 160 591). The Office Action states that Fuji discloses all elements of the rejected claims.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 19 are canceled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Fuji in view of Suzuki (US Pub. 2002/0150722). The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to combine the ultraviolet curing resin of Suzuki with the invention of Fuji.

Claim 5 is canceled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Fuji. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Fuji to arrive at the claimed invention in view of Fuji's teachings at paragraph [0144] regarding in-plane retardation.

Claim 6 is canceled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Appl. No. : 10/510,466
Filed : October 7, 2004

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Fuji in view of Winston (US Pub. 2002/0061178). The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to combine the low refractive index layer of Winston with the invention of Fuji.

Claim 8 is canceled herein. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claims 2 and 11-18

Claims 2 and 11-18 are pending in this application. The Office Action has indicated that these claims are allowable. Applicants therefore submit that no issues remain in the present application since all pending claims are indicated as allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims are patentable and request that they be passed to issue. Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if any remaining issues might be resolved by telephone.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 26-Feb-07

By:



Kerry Taylor
Registration No. 43,947
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

3465944
022607